

## REMARKS

Claims 1-58 are in the application. Claims 1-11, 17-31, 33-38, 41-43, and 48-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Wong (US Patent 6,700,891). Claims 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong further in view of Jung et al. (US Patent 5,745,229). Claims 32, 39, 40, 44, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong further in view of Fairchild et al. (US Patent 6,343,320). Claims 46 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong further in view of Zintel (US Patent 6,779, 004).

With respect to the provisional rejection of claims 1-58 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-45, 47, 49-59, and 62 of co pending Application No. 09/746,519, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Particularly in view of the claims as amended herein, Applicant submits that the double patenting rejection is obviated. If there are any questions regarding this issue, Applicant's attorney requests an opportunity to discuss such matters with the Examiner by telephone.

While Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in view of Wong, either alone or in combination with Jung, Fairchild, or Zintel, in an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended the independent claims to more specifically recite certain aspects of the present invention involving a physical, user-activated switch/button interface that selectively filters packets or blocks packet transmission. Support for these amendments to the claims may be found in Figures 9 and 10 and the accompanying description, such as on pages 28-31. Applicant submits that, in light of the amendments, the distinctions between the above mentioned claims and the cited references should overcome the Examiner's rejections. Applicant submits that, for at least these reasons, all claims should be allowable.

Finally, Applicant notes that it is still reviewing whether or not Wong is in fact prior art to Applicant's invention. While Applicant does not admit that Wong is in fact prior art to Applicant's invention, and Applicant may demonstrate in the future that Applicant's invention predates Wong, Applicant has chosen herein to emphasize the clear distinction of the claimed invention over the cited combination of references.

Reconsideration and allowance is requested.

Please charge any additional fees due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit  
Account No. 50-0251.

No new matter has been added.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan R. Loudermilk  
Registration No. 32,788  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

February 21, 2006  
Loudermilk & Associates  
P.O. Box 3607  
Los Altos, CA 94024-0607  
408-868-1516